



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/525,551	02/24/2005	Michael Nicolai	VO-701	6056				
<div>7590 01/17/2008</div> <div>Pauley Petersen & Erickson 2800 W. Higgins Road Suite 365 Hoffman Estates, IL 60195</div>								
<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>NORMAN, MARC E</div>								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>ART UNIT</th><th>PAPER NUMBER</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>3744</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>					ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3744	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
3744								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>MAIL DATE</th><th>DELIVERY MODE</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>01/17/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></tbody></table>					MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/17/2008	PAPER
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
01/17/2008	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/525,551

Applicant(s)

NICOLAI ET AL.

Examiner

Marc E. Norman

Art Unit

3744

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc E. Norman.

(3) _____.

(2) Mark Swanson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chu et al., Brodie et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative inquired about various possible responses to the Examiner's rejections in the Office Action mailed 10/9/07, including the applicability of applying the control system for a single computer of Brodie et al. to the multiple rack system of Chu et al. and also the idea of incorporating the cooling system within the computer itself. The Examiner indicated that these arguments did not appear to overcome the rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MARC NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required